

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended. Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, the Office Action alleges that claims 3-5 do not recite subject matter encompassed by the technological arts. Claims 3-5 have been amended to clarify that the recited steps are machine-implemented. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3-5 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Kuppusamy. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites “a document association object linking a reference-source document to a referenced-material document in the database; and a management unit generating property data of the document association object.” Kuppusamy discloses a system where a TOC document 220 is created from a target document 202, and where entries in the TOC document 220 are links to corresponding anchors in the target document 202. There is no document association “object” in the Kuppusamy system. Kuppusamy provides linking elements in the two documents themselves, but there is no document association object. Element 215, mentioned in the Office Action, is just a screen display, it is not a document association object.

Claim 6 likewise recites a “document association object linking a reference-source document to a referenced-material document in the database.” Kuppusamy fails

to disclose or suggest the recited object (element 215 is just a screen display).  
Consequently, claim 6 should be allowable along with claim 1.


Claims 2-4, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kuppusamy in view of Sedlar. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6 and should be allowable along with claim 6 and for other reasons.

Claims 3 and 4, like claims 1 and 6, each recite the step of "a document association object linking a reference-source document to a referenced-material document in the database." This is an important aspect of the claimed invention. It is nowhere disclosed or suggested by Kuppusamy. Sedlar is relied upon in the Office Action for other features. Consequently, for at least these reasons, claims 3 and 4 should be allowable along with claims 1 and 6. Claim 5 depends from claim 3 and should be allowable along with claim 3 and for other reasons.

Favorable action on the application, with claims 1-8, is solicited.

Dated: June 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By  #33,082

Mark J. Thronson, Reg. No.: 33,082

Rachael Lea Leventhal, Reg. No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant